



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/541,339	07/01/2005	Kiyofumi Fukasawa	121036-0085	7740	
35684	7590	07/06/2009	EXAMINER		
BUTZEL LONG		EGWIM, KELECHI CHIDI			
IP DOCKETING DEPT		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER	
350 SOUTH MAIN STREET		1796			
SUITE 300		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
ANN ARBOR, MI 48104		07/06/2009		ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT@BUTZEL.COM
BOUDRIE@BUTZEL.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,339	FUKASAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,14,15 and 17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 2,4-13 and 16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. As claim 2 depends from claim 16, and claim 16 recited a methyl ethyl ketone content in the adhesive composition of “not more than 10 wt%”, it unclear what the “3 to 40 wt% of methyl ethyl ketone” recited in claim 2 is based on. Is this based on the adhesive composition, as in claim 16, the emulsion or the phenol resin? The claim is still unclear regarding this weight bases.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 2, 4-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warren (USPN 5,200,455), Suzuki et al. (JP 06306340) or Eguchi et al. JP 61278579, each in combination with Tsuji et al. (USPN 5,346,957), Moriyama et

al. (JP 2002194060) and Hagiwara et al. (JP 05025451), individually, for reasons cite in the previous action.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 6/22/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
7. Regarding the 112's., the rejections of claims 5, 6 and 11-13 have been withdrawn, but the rejection of claim 2 has been maintained for reasons stated above.
8. Regarding Suzuki et al., applicant appears to be ignoring the aqueous disposition taught to be produced in Suzuki et al., where the organic dispersant is 1-10%.(see abstract) of the dispersion. Thus, such a dispersion is present in the teachings of Suzuki et al.
9. In response to applicant's argument that Eguchi et al. fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "aqueous" phenol resin emulsion) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Also, in the abstract, Eguchi et al. teaches that the resin blend may be in the form of a dispersion.

10. Regarding Warren and the argument that the reference is “comparable” to the prior art upon which applicants' invention is an improvement, applicant must argue the merits of the claimed invention over all that Warren teaches, not only the segment that may be similar to a different reference all together. It is unclear what distinction applicant is attempting to make between Warren's actual teachings and the present claims.

It is noted that the methyl ethyl ketone “being not more than 10 wt%” in claim 16, is an optional feature, which may be 0% in content.

11. Regarding Tsuji et al., Moriyama et al., and Hagiwara et al., in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without **specifically** pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim whose telephone number is (571) 272-1099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

KCE